

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4-21 remain pending in the application, with claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 are sought to be amended. Claim 3 remains canceled. Entry and consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this amendment.

Applicants have made the above amendment to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0143529 (hereinafter referred to as "Schmid") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,708,885 (hereinafter referred to as "Beutnagel"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection since Schmid and Beutnagel, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of independent claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 and their respective dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 19-21 for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 include a similar feature of: assigning each of the generic and non-generic words a confidence level based on a set of rules followed by the speech engine and wherein the generic and non-generic words that are part of a particular application are assigned a higher confidence level than the generic and non-generic words that

**Reply to final office action mailed on January 19, 2006**

are not part of the particular application. Applicants respectfully assert that Schmid and Beutnagel, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this feature of the claimed invention. For at least this reason, independent claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 and their respective dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 19-21 are distinguishable from Schmid and Beutnagel, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-3311 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Thus, Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Dated: February 15, 2006

/Molly A. McCall/ Registration No. 46,126  
Molly A. McCall  
(703) 633-3311

P10364 response to second final OA